



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

from Pennsylvania enjoyed by the proprietors in 1759 was not about £10,000 (p. 136), but about £4,000; Franklin's *Historical Review* is not "an important historical authority" (p. 216). The proper and legal incorporation into the regular proprietary instructions to Gov. Morris of an order sent by the Privy Council to all the colonial governors in 1740—and declared by the attorney-general to be obligatory upon all succeeding governors—forbidding them to pass any act for the issue of bills of credit without the insertion of a clause suspending its execution until the king's pleasure was made known, can hardly be construed as an attempt on the liberties of the assembly, in which "the proprietors were aided and abetted by the Privy Council" (p. 149). To the student of comparative colonial administration, French and English, furthermore, Mr. Fisher's opinion (p. 150) that if the Pennsylvania assembly had yielded to this and similar attempts "the province might just as well have been conquered by the French," and that "her chance for liberty under the French would have been better," will seem based upon prejudice.

With the exception of such *corrigenda*, which ought not to appear in the composition of a work even primarily designed for popular reading any more than if intended for historical students alone, *Pennsylvania, Colony and Commonwealth*, fulfills its mission well.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

The Life of Roger Sherman. By LEWIS HENRY BOUTELL. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co. 1896. Pp. ix, 361.)

AMONG American statesmen of the last half of the eighteenth century, Roger Sherman can fairly claim a place in the second rank. He is not to be named with Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, John Adams, Madison or Hamilton; but it would be difficult to make up a list of half a dozen more, on any definite principle of selection, from which he would be omitted. From the day when he stood up as one of the committee of five to report to Congress the draft of the Declaration of Independence, until his death, while a member of the Senate in the first year of Washington's second administration, he occupied continuously a conspicuous position among the political leaders of the country.

A biography that has been delayed for a hundred years, for this is the first extended account of Sherman's life that has ever been written, gains something in richness of material from the published diaries and correspondence of contemporaries and opened doors to public archives, but loses more in the separation of its author from the spirit and the familiar talk of the times of which he treats. Mr. Boutell tells a "plain, unvarnished tale," set out with very little of warmth or color. There was, indeed, nothing in his subject to awake enthusiasm. Sherman, while quick-witted and gifted with a keen sense of humor, which he often brought into effective play in debate, was of a self-contained and impassive temperament. Everybody respected and trusted him; he had warm

personal friends, but he never had a general personal following. He was no leader of men, except as he led in measures.

Like Franklin, he had been thrown early on his own resources, and had won his education by the hardest, in the intervals of daily manual labor. It is not the worst way for a strong man. An education bought at that price is held at its true value. The owner never forgets what it has cost him, and seldom fails to put it to its best use. Sherman's self-education soon turned a shoemaker into a surveyor, the surveyor into a lawyer, the lawyer into a judge, and the judge into a statesman. He was a good subject for it, by right of heredity. While he learned his trade of his father, his grandfather was a leading man in Watertown, Massachusetts, and his great-grandfather was the principal surveyor in the colony and the son of an English manufacturer in easy circumstances, several of whose ancestors had been members of the House of Commons.

Sherman removed from Massachusetts to Connecticut soon after he came of age and settled in New Milford, then a frontier town, where he established himself as a surveyor, under a colony commission, and within a few years prepared the first of a series of almanacs, which were annually published in New York under his name from 1750 until 1761. In 1752 he published anonymously a tract on the evils of paper currency as tender in payment of debts, written in simple, plain English, after the style of Poor Richard, and arguing the subject mainly on its legal side. Two years later he was admitted to the bar. Shortly after followed an election to the General Assembly, a body of which he remained a member, in one branch or the other, during most of his life. He removed to New Haven in 1761, and five years later was elected a judge of the Superior Court.

Sherman was a strong friend of the ecclesiastical establishment which then existed in Connecticut. His biographer gives an interesting letter which he wrote to the colony agent at London in 1768, in regard to the petitions which had been sent over by some of the Episcopal clergy for the appointment of an American bishop. He urged the importance of an act of Parliament to declare that such a bishop should have no political or judicial authority, remarking that "our fathers and even some of ourselves have seen and heard the tyranny of Bishops' Courts."

Sherman was among the first to deny the right of Parliament to regulate American trade. In a letter to Thomas Cushing of Boston, written in 1772, he urges the impolicy of any concessions by the colonial legislatures as to that point, and asks how, if it is a fundamental principle in the British Constitution that no laws bind the people but such as they consent to be governed by, the people of the colonies have not as good a title to its protection as their fellow-subjects in England. He went, full of these ideas, to the first Continental Congress in Carpenter's Hall, in 1774, and early in its discussions stated them at a meeting of the principal committee. The colonies, he said, were not corporations subordinate to the power of Parliament. Their own assemblies alone could make laws for them. They had adopted the common law, not because it was the common law, but because it was the highest reason.

Sherman was one of the committee to draft the Articles of Confederation in 1776, and proposed to them to have the votes of Congress taken by calling first the colonies, and then all the delegates individually, and requiring for the adoption of any measure the consent of a majority of both; anticipating here, in substance, as Mr. Boutell remarks, the compromise by which, under our present Constitution, Congress was divided into two houses, one representing the states and the other the people. Of the immediate necessity of forming some regular confederated government he entertained no doubt. "If it is not done," he wrote, in 1777, to Samuel Adams, "while the war lasts I fear it will not be done at all."

His views on paper currency were thus expressed in a letter to Gov. Trumbull in 1780: "Paper money does its office when it goes out in payment, and ought to be among the people as a medium of trade no longer than to find its way into their pockets; and, like private security, should be destroyed when returned into the office it issued from . . . To re-issue bills taken in by loans and taxes accumulates the public debt in a way not open to the inspection of the people."

In 1783, as a member of a commission to revise the laws of Connecticut, he framed a statute allowing suits on joint contracts where some of the defendants lived out of the state, judgment to go against all, on service of process on those who were inhabitants, reserving a remedy, by writ of *Audita Querela*, in favor of any non-resident who might claim that he had a defense and no opportunity of making it. Similar laws have since been passed by most of our states, and have proved of great convenience.

Sherman's work in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 has been previously sketched by Mr. Boutell in a valuable paper, read before the American Historical Association. A statement, still more valuable, is now given of his contribution to the framework of our national legislation, while a member, first of the House of Representatives, and then of the Senate, during the last four years of his life. It was a substantial and durable contribution. He was often on the floor, and always spoke with effect and to the exact point in issue. When the first revenue bill was under discussion a Virginian member moved to impose a duty of ten dollars on each slave imported, in order, as he said, to prevent the inhuman traffic, and do away with the inconsistency of our principles, as shown by contrasting our laws with our Declaration of Independence. Sherman replied that the principles of the motion and those of the bill before the house were certainly inconsistent, for the principle of the bill was to raise revenue, while that of the motion was to correct a moral evil; and that as a revenue measure it was unjust, because two or three states would bear the whole burden.

He was one of the strongest defenders of the theory that the Constitution was established by the people at large, acting as a political whole. The Tenth Amendment was reported to the House in this form: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively." It

was at his instance that the House added the all important words, "or to the people."

Mr. Boutell was given free access to an extremely valuable collection of Sherman MSS. collected by Senator Hoar of Massachusetts. One memorandum he prints in *fac simile*, which Sherman handed to Madison during the debate on the bill to establish the first Bank of the United States. It states in a few words the argument afterwards elaborated by Chief Justice Marshall in the great case of *McCulloch vs. Maryland*. The book is also enriched by a number of family stories which tradition has preserved. The best of them is told in connection with a visit which Washington once made at Sherman's house. As he rose to go, Mehetabel Sherman, a girl of twelve (and afterwards the mother of William M. Evarts, of New York), ran to open the front door for him. Putting his hand kindly on her head as he passed out, Washington said, "You deserve a better office, my little lady." "Yes, sir," she replied with a curtsy, "to let you in."

Mr. Boutell has preferred a topical rather than a chronological arrangement of his material, and it is doubtful whether Sherman's was a character that can be best treated in that manner. He tells his story clearly, however, and without padding, and although the work bears some evidence of haste in its preparation it is one of substantial value to the historical student.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

George Washington. By WOODROW WILSON. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1897. Pp. ix, 333.)

The True George Washington. By PAUL LEICESTER FORD. (Philadelphia: The J. B. Lippincott Co. 1896. Pp. 317.)

HERE are two volumes on the Father of his Country, written by two very clever authors, appearing simultaneously, but treating their subjects very differently. Professor Wilson, by a brilliant summing up of the claims of his hero, has justified the crowning of him as Prince of Men by that well-nigh universal acclaim which has pronounced him the "Best of Great Men, and the Greatest of Good Men." As a literary artist he has made with his pen as true a representation as did Houdon with his chisel.

The author commences with a fine chapter on the character, manners and customs of the Virginia society in which Washington was reared. As the immigrant ancestor of Washington was a royalist, and many royalists came to Virginia during the days of the Commonwealth, there was a temptation to enlist with those who maintain that Virginia got her character from her cavaliers. In doing so, however, our author has ventured on disputed ground. The late Hugh Blair Grigsby, than whom no one was more deeply versed in Virginia history, in his *Discourse on the Virginia Convention of 1776*, ably maintains that the character of Virginia society was first formed by the men of moderate means who came